DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 692 SP 004 092

AUTHOR Collins, James F.
TITLE Identifying New and Emerging Patterns of School-University Partnerships in Teacher Education--and Their Implications for Research.
INSTITUTION Syracuse Univ., N.Y. School of Education.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting March, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.55
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation, *Educational Research, *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

While some real differences of opinion exist regarding the governance of teacher education, many new organizational patterns including new and more sophisticated patterns of school-university partnerships are appearing on the professional scene. There is a strong and rapid insurgence of student teaching centers with such organizational features as full-time center coordinators and joint councils with policy-making responsibilities composed of representatives from the state department of education, all participating institutions of higher education, and the school system. Another pattern is the metro council for student teaching for pooling of ideas, personnel, materials resources, and efforts, often with all cooperation institutions assuming equal accountability for all or any phase of the program, which extends from preservice through the advanced stages of inservice teacher education. The presence of federal dollars, a major thrust toward such partnership, is designed to make teacher education more relevant and more professional. Among several implications for research is the need to examine very closely the impact of a wider sharing of decision-making responsibilities on the 1) quality of learning in the public schools, 2) quality of personnel coming into the profession, 3) quality of education in the teacher education programs and 4) strength and direction of the profession (professionalization). (JS)

ED042692

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IDENTIFYING NEW AND EMERGING PATTERNS OF SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS IN TEACHER EDUCATION— AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

[T

James F. Collins [A
Assistant Dean
School of Education
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York
(Formerly of the University of Maryland)

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, March, 1970 PD
Minneapolis, Minnesota

SP004092

Identifying New and Emerging Patterns of School-University Partnerships in Teacher Education and Their Implications for Research

In 1945 A. R. Mead in his twenty-fifth anniversary message to the Association for Student Teaching predicted "... a gradual diminution of the work of the campus training schools...and an extension of their work ...into various forms of experiences off the campus of the college or the university."[1]

Last week I had the good fortune to attend the fiftieth anniversary banquet for that Association and to reflect on the changes wrought by twenty-five years. Twenty-five years ago approximately ninety percent (90%) of all of the direct experiences in teacher preparation programs were conducted on the campuses of colleges and universities. Now a short two and one half decades later the opposite seems to be true; only about ten percent (10%) of the clinical experiences for teacher preparation are provided in on-campus centers while about ninety percent (90%) are in off-campus laboratories.

While the locus of clinical experiences has changed during the last twenty-five years many other things have changed as well. Most noteworthy among these other changes are the attitudes and purposes of the people and institutions involved in programs of teacher development.

Twenty-five years ago about the only motivations for any dialogue between schools and colleges were based on such reasons as: "we need your classrooms; you need our teachers" or "we need your consultant help; we need your courses."

---

[1]Mead, A. R., Twenty-fifth Anniversary Message, Practicing Democracy in Teacher Education, 24th Yearbook, 1945-46, pp. 61-62.

Today there are many motivations dictating far more essential dialogue dealing with critical issues in teacher education.

Earlier eras have been characterized by unilateral decision making, primarily on the part of the colleges and universities. Today we are moving toward bilateral or joint decision-making by all who are affected. In a very real sense until very recently the public seemed to have placed the final responsibility for teacher education with the institutions of higher education. However more recently the practicing profession and in fact the broader community, including parents and students, are questioning the exclusive domination of teacher education by the colleges and universities and are seeking an earlier and more essential role in determining what happens to teachers prior to their coming into the profession.

Thus some real differences exist regarding the governance of teacher education. Who should be rightfully responsible for what?

Conant has suggested a division of responsibility, saying the university should be responsible entirely for the academic content, the foundational study and the methodology. The state, representing the public and the practicing profession, should be responsible for certifying practice with joint participation of school and colleges in establishing professional laboratories and programs of supervision. His idea of the clinic professor would promote this latter point.

This position has been studied and debated over the years with the colleges usually taking the position that field experiences and the supervision of these has to be rightfully the responsibility of the colleges - while on the other hand the practicing profession has typically assumed the posture, at least theoretically if not actually, that it should be the

one with whom the responsibility for setting standards and routes by which people enter the profession is placed.

These polarities have been aggravated by the feeling on the part of the colleges that the practicing profession is incapable or inadequate to assume such responsibilities - the implication being that the practicing profession is presently incompetent in the areas of teacher education, training, supervision and induction. On the other hand the public schools have constantly accused the colleges of being insensitive to the needs of public education, irrelevant to the times and too removed from the "real world" to be adequate for the responsibility.

Over and above this the lay public can be heard to say more clearly today than ever before - that - "The education of our teachers is too critical to be left to the teacher educators."

Moved by these differences, differences that at least in part are generated by different philosophies of how teachers should be prepared and by whom, and in fact torn by these differences almost to the point of being professionally impotent, we find ourselves having to come up with some new and different ways of assuming our responsibilities for teacher education - and of finding some new avenues for bringing together ideas, resources, personnel, and energies into a united effort along a common front.

Many new organizational patterns as well as some new and more sophisticated patterns of school-university partnerships are appearing on the professional scene.

While not entirely new we see a strong and rapid insurgence of <u>student teaching centers</u>.

Student teaching centers, as the name implies, typically are off-campus schools where, by mutual agreement, a college or university places a number of student teachers.

Originally, while it was a tremendous step forward from the conventional pattern of assigning students to many widely scattered classrooms, throughout a school system, it typically still perpetuated unilateral controls and unilateral decision-making. The university for the most part dictated policy, standards, and procedures, etc.

More recently, however, we have begun to see student teaching centers taking on a broader function with more extensive involvement. The Kanawha County Student Teaching Center in West Virginia is an example of this; where the state department of education plays a coordinating function, where there are a number of institutions of higher education feeding students into the center, and where the center is county-wide as opposed to one or two school buildings.

With the rise of this kind of cooperative action two other things are becoming increasingly more prevalent (1) full-time center coordinators are being employed and (2) joint councils with policy making responsibility are being created with representation from the state department of education, all the participating institutions of higher education and the school system.

Again, if one where to examine this pattern of school-university partnership one would notice that it is still heavily administratively and logistically oriented. Students from a particular college are still supervised almost exclusively by a representative from that college. There still does not seem to be evidence of the practicing profession

making much, if any, impact on the pre-student teaching professional sequence offered back on campus or of the colleges having any extensive involvement in the in-service. The focus is generally limited to student teaching only.

Another pattern that is emerging and I believe more in areas of concentrations of resources, and populations such as the metropolitan areas of Atlanta and Washington, D. C. is what is sometimes referred to as Metro Councils for Student Teaching.

Again this is an effort to bring together all of the participating institutions into a partnership to improve the program as well as the administrative and logistical aspects. By pooling ideas, personnel, material resources, and efforts the common causes can be greatly promoted. These kinds of partnerships serve as conduits for making available, and hopefully more available, to the participating colleges more and hopefully better classrooms for student teachers. They also serve to make more available and hopefully more readily available the resources of the colleges to the public school personnel in the form of courses, workshops, seminars and consultant services. Convinced that true cooperation in teacher education was a "sine-qua-non" if the profession was to move forward and convinced that the essence of true cooperation was joint decision making with the resultant of joint responsibility and joint accountability, the Teacher Education Centers in Maryland were established in 1966. The distinguishing features of a Teacher Education Center as opposed to a student teaching center are: (a) The Teacher Education Center has for its focus <u>all</u> of teacher education not just student teaching. (b) The public school assumes earlier and more essential responsibility for the

pre-service program. (C) The college assumes increased responsibility for the in-service program by its remaining visibly and actively present in the schools. (D) The Center is a laboratory for pre-student teaching experiences, student teaching experiences and graduate practica and internships. (E) All personnel in the Center professional as well as pre-professionals are students of teaching. (F) In-service and pre-service come together on a continuum. (G) Methods and practice are brought together in one place at one time which also brings together the theoretical (on campus) faculty with the clinic (off campus) faculty - in a continuing working relationship. (H) Pre-service and in-service programs are individualized according to the needs of the individual. (I) Supervision of professional staff development, pre-service and/or in-service is done by a team of people drawn from the school system, the university and possibly from the state department of education. (J) A full time coordinator is employed equally by the university and the school system to coordinate the staff development program for both the pre-service professionals and in-service professionals.

This form of cooperation dictates almost a third organization or at least an organizational structure which is in a very real sense a vital part of each of the cooperating institutions but is not entirely dependent upon one or the other and in fact is no more dependent on one than on another. Rather it is somewhat independent from the individual participating units, sometimes referred to as a pro-cooperative relationship.

This partnership has a policy council made up of the policy makers of the cooperating institutions. It meets to decide on or resolve

conflicting policies. Once resolved, the decision is binding on both or all institutions.

Thus all cooperating institutions at this point assume equal partnership and equal accountability for all or any phase of the Center program which extends from pre-service through the advanced stages of in-service teacher education.

Another important factor in teacher education today is the presence of federal dollars - particularly the TTT monies coming through the EPD Bureau.

A major thrust of these federally supported programs seems to be in the direction of making the academic community as well as the lay community more active and more essential partners in the decision-making that relates to teacher education. This should have the effect of making teacher education more relevant and more professional.

Implications for Research:

(A) We need to examine very closely the impact of a wider sharing of the decision making responsibilities on the: (1) quality of learning in the public schools, (2) quality of personnel coming into the profession, (3) quality of education in the teacher education programs and (4) strength and direction of the profession (professionalization).

(B) Will wider involvement actually produce a better, more relevant, more sensitive, more responsible, more dedicated, more scholarly, more competent teacher? Or will it simply water done standards?

(C) Will these partnerships have the effect of advantageously uniting the profession for better teacher education and better teaching or

will they simply develop a different set of "power blocks" without any perceptible differences in sensitivities to needs?

(D) Can more effective procedures for researching processes and the impact of processes on behavioral modification, be developed?

(E) In conclusion then, do we not need better, more scientific, more objective, and more empirical ways of determining specifically what we intend to do and how we plan to accomplish it; and then to measure their impact on teaching and learning?

(F) Roles, relationships and responsibilities need to be constantly studied, developed and redeveloped.

(G) Models need to be developed,explored, and field tested. The findings from these ought to dictate the organizational and administrative structure by which the various cooperating agencies join forces to accomplish the job in a way that "will make a difference in teacher education."